

REMARKS

These remarks are in response to an office action dated September 9, 2004. The office action suggested that Applicants' reply filed on June 7, 2004 does not comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.11(b) because it did not "include arguments pointing out specific distinctions believed to render newly added claims 23-27 patentable over the applied references." (*Office Action dated September 9, 2004* at p. 2). Applicants would like to note that all of new claims 23-27 are dependent on independent claim 19. Also, independent claim 19 was indicated as being allowable. (*Office Action dated April 2, 2004* at p. 12). Therefore, dependent claims 23-27 are allowable at least because the dependent claims incorporate the allowable limitations of independent claim 19. ("Examiners are reminded that a dependent claim is directed to a combination including everything recited in the base claim and what is recited in the dependent claim. It is this combination that must be compared with the prior art, exactly as if it were presented as one independent claim.") (MPEP 608.01(n)). In particular, as the office action dated April 2, 2004 indicates in the "Allowable Subject Matter," claim 19 is allowable because the prior art "fails to anticipate, make obvious, or fairly suggest" an editor to "manipulate the checked-out database item, and a first program comparing the version of the database item in the source code control system with the version of the database item in the database, where the editor manipulates the database item as a function of the comparison." (*Office Action dated April 2, 2004* at p. 12).

The new dependent claims simply add additional features to the already allowed claim. For example, dependent claim 23 further recites that "the first program requests to check out the database item and a second program checks out the database item to the first program." Moreover, claims 24 and 25 further depend from claim 23, and recite features directed to a choice of one or more different versions of the database item at the source code control system and database that may be identical. As with the independent claim 19 from which they depend, none of these features are taught in the prior art of record.

Similarly, claim 25 adds the additional feature where "the first program requests to check in the database item and the second program checks in the database item into the source code control system." Claim 27 depends from claim 26 which depends from allowed claim 19, and further recites the feature of allowing the first program and second program to

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0508/37457.1
Application No.: 09/235,038
Office Action Dated: September 9, 2004

PATENT

check in the database item, perhaps being saved to the database. Again, as with the independent claim 19 from which they depend, none of these features are taught in the prior art of record.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the object to claims 23-27 under 37 C.F.R. 1.11(b).

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0508/37457.1
Application No.: 09/235,038
Office Action Dated: September 9, 2004

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney Vincent J. Roccia at (215-564-8946).

Date: October 8, 2004



Vincent J. Roccia
Registration No. 43,887

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439